



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/541,564

07/06/2005

Jozef J. I. Van Dun

62996A

5827

109 7590 02/05/2009

The Dow Chemical Company
Intellectual Property Section
P.O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967

EXAMINER

GRAY, JILL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/05/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gessner 5,108,827 is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment.

The rejection of claims 1-9 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choe et al., 5,654,097 in view of applicants' amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gessner 5,108,827 in view of PCT Publication WO 01/49908 A2 (Newkirk).

Gessner discloses multiconstituent fibers composed of dispersed blends of at least two different immiscible thermoplastic polymers having a dominant continuous phase with at least one noncontinuous phase dispersed therein. See entire document, and for example abstract. In addition, while Gessner is silent as to the specific interfacial tension between his polymers, it is noted that he teaches the same type of polymers disclosed by applicants as being suitable. Accordingly, the examiner has reason to believe that the interfacial tension of the polymer mixtures disclosed by Gessner are within the instant claimed range in the absence of factual evidence to the contrary. Applicants are invited to provide such evidence. Gessner does not specifically disclose bicomponent fibers with a polyolefin continuous phase.

Newkirk teaches bicomponent and multicomponent fibers comprising a blend of polyolefins, wherein one embodiment includes the polymer components arranged in a sheath-core configuration and the sheath is formed of the polymer blend to impart the desired properties to the fibers. In addition, Newkirk teaches that his blends include immiscible and miscible polymer blends and that polyolefin can be the continuous phase. See entire document, and for example pages 4-5 and 9-12.

Though Gessner is silent as to the formation of bicomponent fibers, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gessner by forming bicomponent fibers with the reasonable expectation of success of producing fabrics and nonwovens having good tensile properties and excellent softness.

Regarding claims 6-7 and 10-19, Gessner is as set forth above, but does not specifically teach the melting point and glass transition point differential or that the disperse polymer is in particulate form or the thickness of the dispersed particulates. Also, Figure 1 discloses wherein the dispersed polymer comprises a portion of the fiber surface, per claims 18 and 19. Gessner discloses that the skilled artisan can select from several polymers commensurate with the desired end properties as long as the polymers are immiscible. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to choose the specific melting point differential and glass transition point differential during routine experimentation for optimization purposes. In addition, Gessner discloses that the dispersed phase exists as an elongated fibrillar polymer domain. The limitation with respect to the particulate thickness and particle size these requirements are drawn

Art Unit: 1794

to the size of the particles, wherein changes in size are not construed to be a matter of invention in the absence of factual evidence to the contrary. Regarding claims 6-7 and 10-11, Gessner teaches fibers comprising PE dispersed in a PP phase. This teaching would have provided motivation to the skilled artisan for multiconstituent fibers comprising a core of propylene polymer. Regarding the thickness of the sheath, this limitation would have been obvious to determine during routine experimentation. Moreover, this requirement is drawn to the size of the fiber and changes in size ordinarily are not a matter of invention.

Therefore, the combined teachings of Gessner and Newkirk would have rendered obvious the invention as claimed in present claims 1-4 and 6-19.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1794

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill Gray whose telephone number is 571-272-1524.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton I. Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jill Gray
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1794

Application/Control Number: 10/541,564
Art Unit: 1794

Page 6

/Jill Gray/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794